arXiv:math/9411208v1 [math.LO] 22 Nov 1994

SEMI-COHEN VERSUS COHEN ALGEBRAS

Jindřich Zapletal

The Pennsylvania State University

Abstract. We show that there are semi-Cohen Boolean algebras which cannot be completely embedded into Cohen Boolean algebras. Using the ideas from this proof, we give a simpler argument for a theorem of S. Koppelberg and S. Shelah, stating that there are complete subalgebras of Cohen algebras which are not Cohen themselves.

0. Introduction.

Probably the best-known and most analyzed species of complete Boolean algebras are the Cohen algebras $\mathbb{C}(\kappa)$, representing the regular open subsets of $\{0,1\}^\kappa$. Their internal structure is quite well understood from the algebraic as well as forcing point of view. Motivated by some previous work [Ko], S. Fuchino and T. Jech proposed the following notion, intended to capture all of the combinatorial content of "being a $\mathbb{C}(\kappa)$" :

Definition 1. *A complete Boolean algebra B is semi-Cohen if $S = \{A \in [B]^{\aleph_0} : A$ is a regular subalgebra of $B\}$ contains a closed unbounded set in $[B]^{\aleph_0}$.*

Thus semi-Cohen algebras behave locally much like Cohen algebras. This would suggest a close relationship, if not equality, between the two classes of algebras. Indeed, it turns out that every $\mathbb{C}(\kappa)$ is semi-Cohen and every semi-Cohen algebra of uniform density $\aleph_1$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}(\aleph_1)$. We have

Question 1. *Is every semi-Cohen algebra of uniform density κ isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}(\kappa)$?*

Now being semi-Cohen is a property hereditary to complete subalgebras, and it has been unclear how to obtain a similar result for Cohen algebras. Thus, the following two approximations to Question 1 are interesting, too:

Question 2. [J2] *Does every semi-Cohen algebra completely embed into a Cohen algebra?*

Question 3. [J2, Ka, Ko, KS] *Is every complete subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}(\kappa)$ of uniform density κ isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}(\kappa)$?*

Recently, S. Koppelberg and S. Shelah [KS] showed that Question 3, and *a posteriori* Question 1, has a negative answer. We prove that Question 2 has a negative answer as well and provide an easier argument for the theorem in [KS].In

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 06E05.

the first section we give an example of a semi-Cohen algebra of uniform density $\mathfrak{c}^+$ which cannot be embedded into a Cohen algebra. In the second section we exhibit a complete subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}(\aleph_2)$ of uniform density $\aleph_2$ which is not isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}(\aleph_2)$.

Theorem 1 is due to the author. Theorem 2 is due to S. Koppelberg and S. Shelah [KS]; we present a much cleaner and simpler argument. The author would like to thank B. Balcar and T. Jech for patiently listening to the proofs.

Our notation follows the set-theoretic standard as set forth in [J1]. In a forcing notion we write $p \geq q$ to mean that q is more informative than p. also $p \perp q$ means that p and q are incompatible. If $\langle P, \leq \rangle$ is a partially ordered set (a *poset*) and $R \subset P$ we say that R is a *regular subposet* of P if every maximal antichain in $\langle R, \leq \rangle$ is a maximal antichain in $\langle P, \leq \rangle$, or, equivalently, $\forall p_0 \in P\ \exists p_1 \in R\ \forall p_2 \in R\ p_2 \leq p_1$ implies that p_2 and p_0 are compatible. For $I \subset Ord$ we understand $\mathbb{C}(I)$ as $RO(C(I))$, where $C(I) = \{p : p \text{ is a function}, dom(p) \in [I]^{<\aleph_0} \text{ and } rng(p) \subset 2\}$ ordered by extension. H_θ is a collection of sets hereditarily of cardinality $< \theta$. $TC(x)$ is the transitive closure of x. We define a strict ordering $\ll$ on ${}^\omega\omega$ by $f \ll g$ if (a) for all but finitely many $n \in \omega$ $f(n) \leq g(n)$ and (b) for infinitely many $n \in \omega$ $f(n) < g(n)$.

1. The first example.

We give a negative answer to Question 2.

Theorem 1. *There is a semi-Cohen algebra of uniform density $\mathfrak{c}^+$ which cannot be embedded into a Cohen algebra.*

Proof. As usual, we prefer to deal with posets rather than with complete Boolean algebras. In this spirit, we give

Definition 2. *A poset $\langle P, \leq \rangle$ is semi-Cohen if $S = \{R \in [P]^{\aleph_0} : R$ is a regular subposet of $P\}$ contains a closed unbounded set in $[P]^{\aleph_0}$.*

We can easily justify our choice of terminology by

Lemma 1. *P is semi-Cohen iff $RO(P)$ is semi-Cohen.* $\square L1$

Let $I \subset Ord$. We define a poset $P(I)$ as follows:

Definition 3. *$P(I) = \{p : p$ is a function, $dom(p) \in [I]^{<\aleph_0}, \exists n_p \in \omega\ \forall \alpha \in dom(p)$ $p(\alpha) \in {}^{n_p}\omega\}$ ordered by $p_0 \geq p_1$ if $dom(p_0) \subset dom(p_1)$, $n_{p_0} \leq n_{p_1}$, $\forall \alpha \in dom(p_0)$ $p_0(\alpha) \subset p_1(\alpha)$ and $\forall i \in n_{p_1} \setminus n_{p_0}$ $\forall \beta < \alpha$ both in $dom(p_0)$ we have $p_1(\beta)(i) \leq p_1(\alpha)(i)$.*

The important properties of the $P(I)$'s are recorded in

Lemma 2.

(1) *If $J \subset I$ then $P(J)$ is a regular subposet of $P(I)$; consequently, $P(I)$ is semi-Cohen.*
(2) *$P(I)$ has uniform density $|I| + \aleph_0$.*
(3) *Let $F \subset P$ be generic. For $\alpha \in I$ we define $f_\alpha = \bigcup_{p \in F} p(\alpha) \in {}^\omega\omega$. Then $\alpha < \beta \in I$ implies $f_\alpha \ll f_\beta$.*
(4) *$\langle f_\alpha : \alpha \in I \rangle$ determines F : namely, $G = \{p \in P(I) : \forall \alpha \in dom(p)\ p(\alpha) \subset f_\alpha$ and for all $\alpha > \beta$ both in $dom(p)$ and $i \in \omega \setminus n_{p_\beta}$ $f_\alpha(i) \leq f_\beta(i)\}$*

Proof. We start with (1). Let $J \subset I$ and $p_0 \in P(I)$. Set $p_1 = p_0 \restriction J$. We show that $\forall p_2 \in P_j\ p_2 \leq p_1$ implies that p_0, p_2 are compatible, finishing the proof of regularity. To this aim, fix $p_2 \in P(J), p_2 \leq p_1$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $n_{p_2} \geq n_{p_0}$. (If this is not the case, just strengthen p_2 within $P(J)$ to make it hold.) We define $p_3 \in P(I)$, a common lower bound of p_0, p_2. We let $dom(p_3) = dom(p_0) \cup dom(p_2)$, $n_{p_3} = n_{p_2}$, for $\alpha \in dom(p_2)$ $p_3(\alpha) = p_2(\alpha)$ and for $\alpha \in dom(p_0) \setminus J$ we set $p_3(\alpha)$ to be the function in ${}^{n_{p_2}}\omega$ extending $p_0(\alpha)$ such that $\forall n \in n_{p_2} \setminus n_{p_0}$ $p_3(\alpha)(n) = p_2(\beta)(n)$, if $dom(p_0) \cap J \cap \alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta = max(dom(p_0) \cap J \cap \alpha)$, and $p_3(\alpha)(n) = 0$ otherwise. By the definition of $P(I)$, we have $p_3 \leq p_2, p_3 \leq p_0$ and we are finished.

The immediate consequence of this is that $P(I)$ is semi-Cohen: $S = \{P(J) : J \in [I]^{\aleph_0}\}$ is a closed unbounded set in $[P]^{\aleph_0}$ consisting of regular subposets of P, as we have just proven.

The proofs of (2), (3), (4) are completely elementary and as such are left to the reader. Let us just state that for $p \in P(I), \alpha > \beta$ both in $dom(p)$ we have $p \Vdash$ "$\forall i \in \omega \setminus n_p\ \dot{f}_\beta(i) \leq \dot{f}_\alpha(i)$". $\square$L2

The following Lemma offers an alternative way to view the $P(I)$, for $I = \alpha \in Ord$. It shows how we carefully extend the scale of f_α's and it gives an actual computation of the residue forcing $P_{\alpha+1}/P(\alpha)$. We omit the proof, as it is not difficult and not very relevant for our purposes.

Lemma 3. *Let $\alpha \in Ord$. Then $P(\alpha)$ is isomorphic to a dense subset of a finite support iteration $\langle R_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta : \beta < \alpha\rangle$, where for $\beta \leq \alpha$*

1. *$R_\beta \Vdash$ "a generic subset of $\dot{Q}_\beta$ is given by a function $\dot{f}_\beta \in {}^\omega\omega$"*
2. *$R_\beta \Vdash$ "$\delta < \gamma < \beta$ implies that $\dot{f}_\delta \ll \dot{f}_\gamma$"*
3. *$R_\beta \Vdash$ "$\dot{Q}_\beta = \{\langle s, a\rangle : s \in {}^{<\omega}\omega, a \in [\beta]^{<\aleph_0}\}$ ordered by $\langle s_0, a_0\rangle \geq \langle s_1, a_1\rangle$ if $s_0 \subset s_1, a_0 \subset a_1$ and $\forall i \in dom(s_1 \setminus s_0)\ \forall \gamma \in a\ s_1(i) \geq \dot{f}_\gamma(i)$. If $G \subset \dot{Q}_\beta$ is generic then f_β will be defined as $f_\beta = \bigcup\{s : \langle s, 0\rangle \in G\}$."*

The key idea of the proof of the Theorem is given in the following Lemma, for which we have not found a satisfactory reference:

Lemma 4. *(Folklore?) Let $\kappa \in Ord$. Then $\mathbb{C}(\kappa) \Vdash$ "there is no $\ll$-increasing sequence $\langle \dot{f}_\alpha : \alpha \in (\mathfrak{c}^+)^V\rangle \subset {}^\omega\omega$".*

Remark. This lemma holds true for any antisymmetric relation on ${}^\omega\omega$ defined from parameters in V in place of $\ll$. The only properties of $\mathbb{C}(\kappa)$ we use are c.c.c. and a form of strong homogeneity, see below.

Proof. Assume for contradiction that we have $q \in C(\kappa)$, $q \Vdash$ "$\langle \dot{f}_\alpha : \alpha \in (\mathfrak{c}^+)^V\rangle$ is a $\ll$ increasing sequence". By homogeneity of $\mathbb{C}(\kappa)$ we may assume that $q = 1$. Pick θ large regular and $M_\alpha \prec H_\theta, \alpha \in \mathfrak{c}^+$ so that M_α are countable and $\kappa, \dot{f}_\alpha \in M_\alpha$.

Claim 1. *There are $\beta < \alpha < \mathfrak{c}^+$ and an isomorphism $h : \langle M_\alpha, \in\rangle \to \langle M_\beta, \in\rangle$ such that $h \restriction M_\alpha \cap M_\beta = id$ and $h(\dot{f}_\alpha) = \dot{f}_\beta$.*

Proof of the Claim. By a Δ-system argument, there is $X \subset \mathfrak{c}^+$ of full cardinality and a countable set A such that $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \in X\rangle$ form a Δ-system with a root A. Let $A = \{a_i : i \in \omega\}$ be a one-to-one enumeration. There are only $\mathfrak{c}$ many isomorphism types of $\langle M_\alpha, \in, \dot{f}_\alpha, a_i : i \in \omega\rangle$ and so there are $\beta < \alpha \in X$ and $h : \langle M_\alpha, \in, \dot{f}_\alpha, a_i : i \in \omega\rangle \to \langle M_\beta, \in, \dot{f}_\beta, a_i : i \in \omega\rangle$. Obviously $h(\dot{f}_\alpha) = \dot{f}_\beta$ and

since $A = \{a_i : i \in \omega\} = M_\alpha \cap M_\beta$ and $h(a_i) = a_i$ we have $h \restriction M_\alpha \cap M_\beta = id$ as needed. $\square$C1

Let $\beta < \alpha, h$ be as in the Claim. We extend $h \restriction C(\kappa) \cap M_\alpha$ to an automorphism of $C(\kappa)$ and $V^{\mathbb{C}(\kappa)}$. Let $q \in C(\kappa), q = q_0 \cup q_1 \cup q_2$, where $q_0 = q \cap M_\alpha$, $q_1 = q \cap M_\beta$ and $q_2 = q \setminus (q_0 \cup q_1)$. We set $\bar{h}(q) = h(q_0) \cup h^{-1}(q_1) \cup q_2$. Note that $q_0 \in M_\alpha$ and $q_1 \in M_\beta$. It can be easily verified from the properties of h and the definition of $C(\kappa)$ that $\bar{h}$ is an automorphism of $C(\kappa)$. As such it can be extended to an automorphism of $\mathbb{C}(\kappa)$ and $V^{\mathbb{C}(\kappa)}$, which by abuse of notation we call $\bar{h}$ again.

Claim 2. $\bar{h}(\dot{f}_\alpha) = \dot{f}_\beta, \bar{h}(\dot{f}_\beta) = \dot{f}_\alpha$.

Proof of the Claim. Here we use the c.c.c. of $\mathbb{C}(\kappa)$. It implies that $TC(\dot{f}_\alpha) \subset M_\alpha$. One can prove by $\in$-induction in $V^{\mathbb{C}(\kappa)}$ that for any $\tau \in M_\alpha$, a $\mathbb{C}(\kappa)$-name such that $TC(\tau) \subset M_\alpha$, we have $\bar{h}(\tau) = h(\tau)$ and $\bar{h}(h(\tau)) = h^{-1}(h(\tau))$. $\square$C2

The Lemma follows: $\mathbb{C}(\kappa) \Vdash$ "$\dot{f}_\beta \ll \dot{f}_\alpha$" and at the same time $\mathbb{C}(\kappa) \Vdash$ "$\bar{h}(\dot{f}_\beta) = \dot{f}_\alpha \ll \dot{f}_\beta = \bar{h}(\dot{f}_\alpha)$", since $\ll$ is defined by a formula with parameters in V. However, this is a contradiction with antisymmetricity of $\ll$. $\square$L4

Now we can conclude that $RO(P(\mathfrak{c}^+))$ witnesses the statement of Theorem 1. By Lemma 2 (1) it is semi-Cohen; moreover it adds a $\mathfrak{c}^+$ long $\ll$-increasing sequence of functions in ${}^\omega\omega$ and so by Lemma 4 it cannot be embedded into any $\mathbb{C}(\kappa)$. $\square$T1

Is it consistent that all semi-Cohen algebras of size $\leq \mathfrak{c}$ can be embedded into a Cohen algebra? Is it implied by, let us say, Martin's Axiom?

2. The second example.

Recently, S. Koppelberg and S. Shelah [KS] proved that subalgebras of Cohen algebras are not necessarily Cohen themselves. We have simplified their argument and as the forcing used is quite similar to the one in Theorem 1, we have found it convenient to include our proof here.

Theorem 2. [KS] *There is a complete subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}(\aleph_2)$ of uniform density $\aleph_2$ which is not isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}(\aleph_2)$.*

Proof. Let $I \subset Ord$. We define a poset $P(I)$ as follows:

Definition 4. $P(I) = \{p : p$ *is a function,* $dom(p) \in [I]^{<\aleph_0}, \exists n_p \in \omega\ \forall \alpha \in dom(p)$ $p(\alpha) \in {}^{n_p}\omega\}$ *ordered by* $p_0 \geq p_1$ *if* $dom(p_0) \subset dom(p_1)$, $n_{p_0} \leq n_{p_1}$, $\forall \alpha \in dom(p_0)$ $p_0(\alpha) \subset p_1(\alpha)$ *and* $\forall i \in n_{p_1} \setminus n_{p_0}$ $\forall \beta \neq \alpha$ *both in* $dom(p_0)$ *we have* $p_1(\beta)(i) \neq p_1(\alpha)(i)$.

Thus the forcing $P(I)$ is just the standard forcing for adding an I-indexed family of eventually different functions. By translating the proof of Lemma 2 virtually word by word into the new situation, we obtain

Lemma 5.

(1) *If $J \subset I$ then $P(J)$ is a regular subposet of $P(I)$; consequently, $P(I)$ is semi-Cohen.*
(2) *$P(I)$ has uniform density $|I| + \aleph_0$.*
(3) *Let $F \subset P$ be generic. For $\alpha \in I$ we define $f_\alpha = \bigcup_{p \in F} p(\alpha) \in {}^\omega\omega$. Then $\alpha \neq \beta \in I$ implies $f_\alpha(i) \neq f_\beta(i)$ for all but finitely many $i \in \omega$.*
(4) *$\langle f_\alpha : \alpha \in I\rangle$ determines F : namely, $F = \{p \in P(I) : \forall \alpha \in dom(p)\ p(\alpha) \subset f_\alpha$ and for all $\alpha > \beta$ both in $dom(p)$ and $i \in \omega \setminus n_p$ $f_\alpha(i) < f_\beta(i)\}$*

And as in Theorem 1, we have an iteration representation of $P(I)$ for $I = \alpha \in Ord$. This time we prove it rigorously, as it will be instrumental in the proof of Lemma 8.

Lemma 6. *Let $\alpha \in Ord$. Then $P(\alpha)$ is isomorphic to a dense subset of a finite support iteration $\langle R_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$, where for $\beta \leq \alpha$*

(1) $R_\beta \Vdash$ *"a generic subset of $\dot{Q}_\beta$ is given by a function $\dot{f}_\beta \in {}^\omega\omega$"*
(2) $R_\beta \Vdash$ *"$\delta < \gamma < \beta$ implies that $\dot{f}_\delta(i) \neq \dot{f}_\gamma(i)$ for all but finitely many $i \in \omega$".*
(3) $R_\beta \Vdash$ *"$\dot{Q}_\beta = \{\langle s, a\rangle : s \in {}^{<\omega}\omega, a \in [\beta]^{<\aleph_0}\}$ ordered by $\langle s_0, a_0\rangle \geq \langle s_1, a_1\rangle$ if $s_0 \subset s_1, a_0 \subset a_1$ and $\forall i \in dom(s_1 \setminus s_0)\ \forall \gamma \in a\ s_1(i) \neq \dot{f}_\gamma(i)$. If $G \subset \dot{Q}_\beta$ is generic then f_β will be defined as $f_\beta = \bigcup\{s : \langle s, 0\rangle \in G\}$."*
(4) $R_\beta \Vdash$ *"$\dot{Q}_\beta$ is separative and has uniform density $|\beta| + \aleph_0$".*

Proof. Let R_α be a finite support iteration as described in (3) above. We exhibit a dense subset of R_α isomorphic to $P(\alpha)$. Let $D = \{r \in R_\alpha : \exists n \in \omega\ \forall \beta \in dom(r)\ r \restriction \beta \Vdash$ "$\dot{r}(\beta) = \langle \check{s}_{\beta,r}, dom(r) \cap \beta\rangle$" for some $s_{\beta,r} \in {}^n\omega\}$. Obviously, the function $h : D \to P(\alpha)$ defined by: $h(r)$ is the function p for which $dom(p) = dom(r)$ and $p(\beta) = s_{\beta,r}$, is a poset isomorphism.

We must show that $D \subset R_\alpha$ is dense. Fix $r_0 \in R_\alpha$. We attempt to construct a sequence $\langle r_i, \beta_i, n_i, s_i, a_i : i \in \omega\rangle$ so that $r_0 \geq r_1 \geq \dots$ are elements of R_α, $\beta_0 = max(dom(r_0)) > \beta_1 > \dots$ are ordinals, $n_i \in \omega, s_i \in {}^{n_i}\omega, a_i \in [\beta_i]^{<\aleph_0}$ and

(a) $\forall i \in \omega\ r_{i+1} \restriction \alpha \setminus \beta_i = r_i \restriction \alpha \setminus \beta_i$
(b) $\forall i \in \omega\ r_{i+1} \restriction \beta_i \Vdash$ "$r_i(\alpha_i) = \langle \check{s}_i, a_i\rangle$"
(c) $\forall i \in \omega\ \beta_{i+1} = max(\beta_i \cap dom(r_{i+1}))$.

As the β_i's are decreasing, the construction must stop at some $m \in \omega$. Then $\beta_i : i < m$ are a decreasing enumeration of $dom(r_m)$. Let $n = max\{n_i : i < m\}$. We construct $r \in D$ as follows: $dom(r) = dom(r_m) \cup \bigcup\{a_i : i < m\}$, $\forall \beta \in dom(r)\ r(\beta) = \langle s_{\beta,r}, dom(r) \cap \beta\rangle$ for some $s_{\beta,r}$. If $\beta = \beta_i$ for some $i < m$ then we will have $s_i \subset s_{\beta,r}$. For all pairs (β, k) such that $\beta \in dom(r)$ and $k < n$ and either $\beta \notin dom(r_m)$ or $\beta = \beta_i$ and $n_i \leq k < n$, we choose the values of $r(\beta)(k)$ to be pairwise distinct and also distinct from all elements of $\bigcup_{i<m} rng(s_i)$. By the definition of R_α one can easily verify that $r \leq r_m \leq r_0$. As $r \in D$, we have proven that $D \subset R_\alpha$ is dense.

(2) and (1) are immediate. We turn to (4) and work in V^{R_β}. First we prove separativity of Q_β. Let $\langle s_0, a_0\rangle, \langle s_1, a_1\rangle \in Q_\beta$, $\langle s_0, a_0\rangle \not\leq \langle s_1, a_1\rangle$. We need to find $\langle s_2, a_2\rangle \leq \langle s_0, a_0\rangle, \langle s_2, a_2\rangle \perp \langle s_1, a_1\rangle$. There are three cases:

(a) $s_1 \not\subset s_0$. Find an extension $\langle s_2, a_0\rangle \leq \langle s_0, a_0\rangle$ such that there is $i \in dom(s_0)$ for which $s_2(i) \neq s_0(i)$. $\langle s_2, a_0\rangle$ will do.
(b) $s_1 \subset s_0, a_1 \not\subset a_0$. Fix $\gamma < \beta$ such that $\gamma \in a_1 \setminus a_0$. As f_γ is eventually different from all $f_\delta, \delta \in a_0$, we can find $m \in \omega$ such that $\forall i > m\ \forall \delta \in a_0\ f_\gamma(i) \neq f_\delta(i)$. Consequently we can find $\langle s_2, a_o\rangle \leq \langle s_0, a_0\rangle$ so that there is $i \in dom(s_2) \setminus dom(s_1)$ with $s_2(i) = f_\gamma(i)$. As $\gamma \in a_1$, by the definition of Q_β necessarily $\langle s_2, a_0\rangle \perp \langle s_1, a_1\rangle$ and we are done.
(c) $s_1 \subset s_0, a_1 \subset a_0$. By the definition of Q_β in this case either $\langle s_0, a_0\rangle \leq \langle s_1, a_1\rangle$ or $\langle s_0, a_0\rangle \perp \langle s_1, a_1\rangle$ and we are done again.

The density part is quite easy. If $|\beta| \leq \aleph_0$ then Q_β is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}(\aleph_0)$ and we are done. So assume $|\beta| \geq \aleph_1$. We have $|Q_\beta| = |\beta|$ and if $E \subset Q_\beta$, $|E| < |\beta|$ then by the pigeonhole principle there is $\alpha < \beta$ such that $\forall \langle s, a\rangle \in E\ \alpha \notin a$. So E

cannot be even locally dense: if $\langle s, a\rangle \in Q_\beta$ then $\langle s, a \cup \{\gamma\}\rangle \leq \langle s, a\rangle$ and there is no element of E below $\langle s, a \cup \{\gamma\}\rangle$. $\square$L6

Notice that we have proven a little more than what was required. Namely, we have shown that there is a sequence $\langle h_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha\rangle$ such that if $\gamma \leq \beta \leq \alpha$ then $h_\gamma : RO(P(\gamma)) \to RO(R_\gamma)$ and $h_\gamma : RO(P(\beta)) \to RO(R_\beta)$ are isomorphisms and $h_\gamma \subset h_\beta$, if we view $RO(P(\gamma)), RO(R_\gamma)$ canonically as subsets of $RO(P(\beta)), RO(R_\beta)$ respectively. The following two lemmas finish the proof of Theorem 2. The witness we need is $RO(P(\omega_2))$.

Lemma 7. *$RO(P(\omega_2))$ can be completely embedded into $\mathbb{C}(\aleph_2)$.*

Lemma 8. *$RO(P(\omega_2))$ is not isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}(\aleph_2)$.*

Proof of Lemma 7. Let R be the set of all functions r satisfying the following four conditions:

(1) $dom(r) \in [(\omega_2 \times 2) \cup \{\omega_2\}]^{<\aleph_0}$
(2) $\alpha \in \omega_2, (\alpha, 0) \in dom(r)$ implies $r(\alpha, 0) \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$
(3) $\alpha \in \omega_2, (\alpha, 1) \in dom(r)$ implies $r(\alpha, 1) \in \omega$
(4) $r(\omega_2)$ is a finite function from ${}^{<\omega}\omega$ to ω which is one-to-one on each ${}^n\omega, n \in \omega$.

R is ordered by coordinatewise extension, i.e. $r_0 \geq r_1$ if $dom(r_0) \subset dom(r_1)$ and $(\alpha, 0) \in dom(r_0)$ implies $r_0(\alpha, 0) \subset r_1(\alpha, 0)$, $(\alpha, 1) \in dom(r_0)$ implies $r_0(\alpha, 1) = r_1(\alpha, 1)$, and $r_0(\omega_2) \subset r_1(\omega_2)$. As the different coordinates behave independently of each other, $RO(R)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}(\aleph_2)$.

Motivation. Let $G \subset R$ be generic and work in $V[G]$. For $\alpha \in \omega_2$ set $g_\alpha = \bigcup_{r \in G} r(\alpha, 0) : \omega \to \omega$, $n_\alpha = r(\alpha, 1)$ for some (any) $r \in G, (\alpha, 1) \in dom(r)$, and $h = \bigcup_{r \in G} r(\omega_2) : {}^{<\omega}\omega \to \omega$. Notice that g_α are mutually generic Cohen reals and h is one-to-one on each ${}^n\omega, n \in \omega$.. We need to obtain $F \subset P(\omega_2)$ which is V-generic. One might be tempted to think that defining $f_\alpha : \omega \to \omega$ by $f_\alpha(n) = h(g_\alpha \restriction n)$, the resulting sequence $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_2\rangle$ could be V-generic for $P(\omega_2)$. (It is indeed a family of eventually different functions!) However, this is too simple to work. Here the n_α's kick in: if we define $f_\alpha(n) = g_\alpha(n)$ for $n < n_\alpha$ and $f_\alpha(n) = h(g_\alpha \restriction n + 1)$ for $n \geq n_\alpha$, the sequence of f_α's will really be sufficiently generic. Of course, we have to justify this statement.

Let D be the set of those $r \in R$ for which $(\alpha, 0) \in dom(r)$ iff $(\alpha, 1) \in dom(r)$ and there is $n_r \in \omega$ such that the $r(\alpha, 0)$'s are distinct elements of ${}^{n_r}\omega$, $r(\alpha, 1) \leq n_r$ and $dom(r(\omega_2)) = \{\sigma \in {}^{<\omega}\omega : \exists \alpha \in \omega_2\ \sigma \subset r(\alpha, 0)\}$. It is not difficult to see that $D \subset R$ is dense. We define a function $Proj : D \to P(\omega_2)$ by: $Proj(r)$ is a function $p \in P(\omega_2)$ such that $\alpha \in dom(p)$ iff $(\alpha, 0) \in dom(r)$, $n_p = n_r$ and $p(\alpha)(n) = r(\alpha, 0)(n)$ for $n < r(\alpha, 1)$ and $p(\alpha)(n) = r(\omega_2)(r(\alpha, 0) \restriction n + 1)$ for $r(\alpha, 1) \leq n < n_p$. The following claim completes the proof of the Lemma, as it shows that for any $G \subset R$ V-generic the filter $F =$ upwards closure of $Proj''G \cap D \subset P(\omega_2)$ will be V-generic as well.

Claim 3.

(1) *For $r_0 \geq r_1$ both in D we have $Proj(r_0) \geq Proj(r_1)$ in $P(\omega_2)$.*
(2) *If $p_0 = Proj(r_0)$ and $p_1 \leq p_0$ then for some $r_2 \leq r_0$ in D we have $p_2 =$*

Proof. For (1), let $r_0 \geq r_1$ in D, $p_0 = Proj(r_0)$ and $p_1 = Proj(r_1)$. First, by the definition of $Proj$, $dom(p_0) \subset dom(p_1)$, $n_{p_0} \leq n_{p_1}$ and $\forall \alpha \in dom(p_0)\, p_0(\alpha) \subset p_1(\alpha)$. The last thing to check here is that for all n with $n_{p_0} \leq n < n_{p_1}$ and all $\alpha \neq \beta$ both in $dom(p_0)$ we have $p_1(\alpha)(n) \neq p_1(\beta)(n)$. For this note that

(a) $p_1(\alpha)(n) = r_1(\omega_2)(r_1(\alpha, 0) \restriction n+1)$ and $p_1(\beta)(n) = r_1(\omega_2)(r_1(\beta, 0) \restriction n+1)$ (this is because we have $r_1(\alpha, 1) = r_0(\alpha, 1) < n$ as well as $r_1(\beta, 1) = r_0(\beta, 1) < n$ by the definition of D)
(b) $r_1(\alpha, 0) \restriction n \neq r_1(\beta, 0) \restriction n$ (this is since already $r_0(\alpha, 0) = r_1(\alpha, 0) \restriction n_{r_0} \neq r_1(\beta, 0) \restriction n_{r_0} = r_0(\beta, 0)$ by the definition of D again. Moreover $n_{r_0} \leq n$) and
(c) $r_1(\omega_2) \restriction {}^n\omega$ is one-to-one, by (4) of the definition of R.

For (2), let $p_0 = Proj(r_0)$ and $p_1 \leq p_0$ in $P(\omega_2)$. We have $dom(p_0) \subset dom(p_1)$ and $n_{p_0} \leq n_{p_1}$. We produce $r_2 \leq r_0$ in D with $p_2 = Proj(r_2) \leq p_1$. We will have $(\alpha, 0) \in dom(r_2)$ iff $\alpha \in dom(p_1)$ and $n_{r_2} = n_{p_1} + 1$.

(d) For $\alpha \in dom(p_0)$ we choose $r_2(\alpha, 0)$ as an arbitrary element of ${}^{n_{p_1}+1}\omega$ extending $r_0(\alpha, 0)$ and we set $r_2(\alpha, 1) = r_0(\alpha, 1)$.
(e) For $\alpha \in dom(p_1 \backslash p_0)$ we let $r_2(\alpha, 0) \restriction n_{p_1} = p_1(\alpha)$ and choose $r_2(\alpha, 0)(n_{p_1})$ to be some integers making all $r_2(\alpha, 0), \alpha \in dom(p_1)$ pairwise distinct. (Notice that all $r_2(\alpha, 0), \alpha \in dom(p_0)$ as defined in (d) are already pairwise distinct, since $r_0(\alpha, 0)$ are.) Moreover we set $r_2(\alpha, 1) = n_{p_1}$.
(f) Finally, we must define $r_2(\omega_2)$. We will have $r_0(\omega_2) \subset r_2(\omega_2)$ and for $\sigma \subset r_2(\alpha, 0)$, $\alpha \in dom(p_0)$, $n_{p_0} < lth(\sigma) \leq n_{p_1}$ we set $r_2(\sigma) = p_1(\alpha)(lth(\sigma) - 1)$. The reader can easily verify that the requirements do not collide and that the resulting function is one-to-one on every ${}^n\omega, n \leq n_{p_1}$. (For this we use the fact that since $p_0 \geq p_1$ in $P(\omega_2)$ if $\alpha \neq \beta$ both in $dom(p_0)$ and $n_{p_0} \leq n < n_{p_1}$ then $p_1(\alpha)(n) \neq p_1(\beta)(n)$.) We extend the function we have obtained to $r_2(\omega_2)$ with $dom(r_2(\omega_2)) = \{\sigma : \exists \alpha \in dom(p_1)\ \sigma \subset r_2(\alpha, 0)\}$ and $r_2(\omega_2)$ one-to-one on each ${}^n\omega, n \leq n_{r_2}$, in an arbitrary manner.

Obviously $r_2 \in D, r_2 \leq r_0$. Let $p_2 = Proj(r_2)$. We need to show that $p_2 \leq p_1$ in $P(\omega_2)$. By the construction of r_2 we have that $dom(p_2) = dom(p_1)$ and $\forall \alpha \in dom(p_1)\ p_1(alpha) \subset p_2(\alpha)$. That leaves us with the last thing to verify, namely $\forall \alpha \neq \beta$ both in $dom(p_1)$ $\forall n \in \omega$ if $n_{p_1} \leq n < n_{p_2}$ then $p_2(\alpha)(n) \neq p_2(\beta)(n)$. In our case $n_{p_2} = n_{p_1} + 1$, so $n = n_{p_1} \geq r_2(\alpha, 1)$ for any $\alpha \in dom(p_1)$ and therefore $p_2(\alpha)(n) = r_2(\omega_2)(r_2(\alpha, 0))$. The required inequality follows from the fact that $r_2(\alpha, 0)$ are all distinct (by (e)) and $r_2(\omega_2) \restriction {}^{n+1}\omega$ is one-to-one. □C3 □L7

Proof of Lemma 8. For contradiction, assume that $h : \mathbb{C}(\aleph_2) \to RO(P(\omega_2))$ is an isomorphism. By a simple closure argument, we can find $\omega_1 < \alpha < \omega_2$ such that $h''\mathbb{C}(\alpha) = RO(P(\alpha))$. Fix $G \times H \subset \mathbb{C}(\alpha) \times \mathbb{C}(\omega_2 \setminus \alpha) = \mathbb{C}(\aleph_2)$ generic over V. Then $h''G \subset RO(P(\alpha))$ is generic over V and is a subset of $h''G \times H \subset RO(P(\omega_2))$, which is generic over V again. Note that $V[G] = V[h''G]$. By mutual genericity of G and H we can conclude that $V[G][H]$ is a Cohen extension of $V[G]$, in particular every $f : \omega \to \omega$ in $V[G][H]$ comes from an extension of $V[G]$ by a $V[G]$-generic filter on $\mathbb{C}(\aleph_0)$. Now $f_\alpha = \dot{f}_\alpha / h''G \times H$ determines a $V[G]$-generic filter on the poset $Q_\alpha = \dot{Q}_\alpha / h''G \in V[G]$, as computed in Lemma 6. So $V[G] \models$ "$RO(Q_\alpha)$ can be completely embedded into $\mathbb{C}(\aleph_0)$". However, this is a contradiction as $V[G] \models$"Q_α has uniform density $\aleph_1$ by Lemma 6(4) while $\mathbb{C}(\aleph_0)$ has uniform density $\aleph_0$." □L8 □T2

References

[J1] T. Jech, *Set Theory*, Academic Press, New York, 1978.

[J2] T. Jech, *Boolean algebras*, handwritten seminar notes (1993).

[Ka] A. Kamburelis, *On cardinal numbers related to Baire property*, preprint (1989).

[Ko] S. Koppelberg, *Characterizations of Cohen algebras*, Papers on General Topology and Applications (S. Andima, R. Kopperman, P. R. Misra, M. E. Rudin and A. R. Todd, eds.), Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 704, 1993, pp. 222–237.

[KS] S. Koppelberg and S. Shelah, *Subalgebras of Cohen algebras need not be Cohen*, preprint (1994).

Department of Mathematics, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802

E-mail address: zapletal@math.psu.edu